

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Crim. No. 05-170 (RJL)
)	
CLIFTON RAY GORHAM,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

**DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO SUPPRESS PHYSICAL EVIDENCE AND
INCORPORATED MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT THEREOF**

Defendant, through undersigned counsel, moves to suppress as evidence against him at trial the weapon allegedly seized on April 19, 2005. Mr. Gorham asks that the Court hold an evidentiary hearing on his motion. The grounds for this motion are set forth below.

Mr. Gorham was indicted and charged with several counts, including felon in possession of a firearm and/or ammunition, assault with a dangerous weapon, and possession of a firearm during the commission of a crime of violence or dangerous offense. The underlying offenses are said to have occurred on April 19, 2005. The government alleges that Mr. Gorham shot a weapon, allegedly at an unknown person, then fled on bike with the weapon, and ultimately tossed the weapon into a truck.

ARGUMENT

The Evidence Seized on or about April 19, 2005 Should Be Suppressed as the Arrest was not Based upon Probable Cause.

The arrest of Mr. Gorham on April 19, 2005, was not based upon probable cause. Officers did not have a warrant when they stopped and arrested Mr. Gorham. Thus, because Mr.

Gorham's seizure was effectuated without a warrant, the government bears the burden of proving that the stop and seizure were legal. See Hayes v. Florida, 470 U.S. 811 (1985); Florida v. Royer, 460 U.S. 491, 500 (1983); United States v. Allen, 629 F.2d 51, 55 (D.C. Cir. 1980). See also Katz v. United States, 389 U.S. 347 (1967); Henry v. United States, 361 U.S. 98 (1958). The government bears the burden of adducing sworn testimony sufficient to satisfy this Court that the facts and circumstances known to the arresting officers at the time they seized Mr. Gorham justified that seizure. United States v. Jenkins, 530 F. Supp. 8, 10 (D.D.C. 1981), citing, Brinegar v. United States, 338 U.S. 160, 175 (1949).

In this case, the initial warrantless stop of Mr. Gorham was unlawful. In addition, there was no probable cause to support Mr. Gorham's seizure. Thus, all of the evidence flowing from the illegal stop and seizure must be suppressed. Wong Sun v. United States, 371 U.S. 471 (1963). Counsel is relying upon the government's representation that there were no statements made by Mr. Gorham.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons described above, this Court should suppress the weapon allegedly seized on April 19, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

A.J. KRAMER
FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER

/s/

Michelle Peterson
Assistant Federal Public Defender
625 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Ste 550
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 208-7500

Gorham's seizure was effected in the United States District Court the burden of proving

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

that the stop and seizure were legal. See Hayes v. Florida, 470 U.S. 811 (1985); Florida v. Royer,

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)

460 U.S. 491, 500 (1983); United States v. Allen, 629 F.2d 51, 55 (D.C. Cir. 1980). See also Katz

Plaintiff,)

v. United States, 389 U.S. 347 (1967); Henry v. United States, 361 U.S. 98 (1958). The

v.) **Crim. No. 05-170 (RJL)**

government bears the burden of adducing sworn testimony sufficient to satisfy this Court that the

CLIFTON RAY GORHAM,)

facts and circumstances known to the arresting officers at the time they seized Mr. Gorham

Defendant.)

justified that seizure. United States v. Jenkins, 530 F. Supp. 8, 10 (D.D.C. 1981), citing, Brinegar

v. United States, 338 U.S. 160, 175 (1949).

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS PHYSICAL EVIDENCE AND

In this ~~INCORPORATED MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT THEREOF~~ condition, there

was no probable cause to stop Mr. Gorham and seize the rifle, and all of the evidence flowing from

his illegal stop and seizure allegedly seized on April 19, 2005 in United States v. Gorham, 371 U.S. 471 (1963).

Grounds for the hearing on the government's representation that there are set forth below

Mr. Gorham. Mr. Gorham was indicted and charged with several counts, including felon in

possession of a firearm and/or ammunition **CONCLUSION** dangerous weapon, and possession of a

firearm. For the reasons discussed above, this Court should suppress the evidence seized

on April 19, 2005 to have occurred on April 19, 2005. The government alleges that Mr. Gorham

shot a weapon, allegedly at an unknown person, and that the weapon, and ultimately

tossed the weapon into a truck.

A.J. KRAMER

FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER

ARGUMENT

The Evidence Seized on or about April 19, 2005/Should Be Suppressed as the Arrest was not Based upon Probable Cause

Michelle Peterson

Assistant Federal Public Defender

625 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Ste 550

The arrest of Mr. Gorham on April 19, 2005 was based upon probable cause.

(202) 208-7500

Officers did not have a warrant when they stopped and arrested Mr. Gorham. Thus, because Mr.